

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD--HOUSE
15 September 1966

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF
THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

President MARCOS. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, I must first thank the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives for his generous introduction.

When your distinguished diplomat by instinct and by necessity, Vice President HUMPHREY, extended to me the invitation of your great leader President Johnson to visit the United States in his now well-storied and effective trips to Asia, I did not expect the distinct honor of addressing a joint session of the U.S. Congress.

For there is no more noble forum than the U.S. Congress. It is the Foro Romano, the Roman Forum of the modern world. For, indeed, in our century, you are more than the voices of the American people or of American civilization. The voices that speak here speak to every man of the world. And it is here, since the 18th century, that the issues of modern times have been expressed and debated. Your decisions impinge upon the lives of the lowly and powerful alike.

Conscious of these circumstances, I come as an Asian, and I come with a message from Asia and especially my country, the Philippines.

For, in culmination of a novel experiment in government, the United States dismantled its colonial machinery in my country some 20 years ago on July 4, 1946. It is as the elected representative of an Asian nation of 32 million people whose independence and destiny in the modern world had been the subject of debate in this Hall, that I stand before you today.

I come before you as the bearer of these messages.

FIRST MESSAGE--FRATERNAL AFFECTION

The first is a message of fraternal affection from the Filipino people.

America occupies a special place in Philippine hearts. So do the American people. And we Filipinos, for our part, are proud to be counted among America's friends and allies.

I have journeyed 10,000 miles across the Pacific and continental America. I have come from Asia, from what some may describe as another world. But I feel at home in your midst.

For here in America I breathe a native air, the air of freedom that has become as much the breath of life for our young Republic as it has been for yours for nearly 200 years.

And in this inner citadel of American democracy, in this Congress of the United States, where the vital pulse of freedom beats strong and true, my own heart is at ease.

At ease and full. For any citizen of the free world, to stand here is to remember how a great Nation was formed in liberty tempered by law. How the greatest of democracies flourished in freedom, and became, in two global wars,

the salvation of the world. And now, at the summit of its power, it is called upon to lead in translating into reality the most cherished of humanity's hopes: peace with justice, in a world rebuilt upon a moral order that insures survival and growth even under the shadow of manmade total destruction.

For a Filipino like myself, to stand here is also to remember that in this kindly land lies one of the fountainheads of his own country's liberties, that from here emanated the generous impulse that made possible a new birth of freedom in the Pacific, that in a very real sense the Philippines is a sister republic of the United States.

That new birth of freedom in our island nation was but the first of many. The independence of the Philippines initiated the dismantling of colonialism in Asia, a historic process that was to extend to Africa and eventually become worldwide. To America belongs the pioneer's honor for bringing about one of the glories of our age: the vast extension of the frontiers of freedom through the emergence of so many new sovereign states.

Filipinos believe that he who does not look back to his origins will not reach his goal. This belief applies to nations as well as men. When I say that we Filipinos have a special regard for America, I look back to a Philippine-American association of more than half a century, during which a friendship was formed strong enough to endure the trials of war, and I hope rich enough in living values to meet the varied and stern challenges of peace.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1898

I look back and it was precisely this spirit of prevailing freedom in the United States, the ripeness of emancipation in your society, that made the Philippine revolutionary leaders in 1898 come into consultation and some terms of partnership with Admiral Dewey, even before a single American had landed on our shores.

The facts are in history: the agreement between President Aguinaldo and Adm. George Dewey; the consensus of opinion between the Filipinos fighting an ancient monarchy and a colonial regime and the Americans regarding the procedure of our finally realizing freedom.

THE PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN WAR

It matters not now to many what the true agreement was between American representatives and Filipino revolutionaries in Hong Kong—as to whether you promised independence, denied it, and claimed the Philippines as a purchase for \$20 million—thus starting the bloody war between your country and mine of 1898 to 1902.

BATAAN AND CORREGIDOR

For you redeemed all of these with such an enlightened colonial policy that the Filipino committed himself to destruction in the frontlines of the lost battles of Bataan and Corregidor as well as the underground under American

higher commanders. The frontiers of these historic places were manned by Filipino troops and Filipino officers.

It matters not except to us that after the Second World War the Filipino soldier felt disowned by you when you approved the law which provided that service of the soldiers of the Philippine Commonwealth inducted to the U.S. Army shall not be considered service in the U.S. Army for purposes of benefits and rights granted by law.

For the American leaders again listening in a spirit of fairness have openly declared an injustice had been committed and you have sought and are still seeking to right this wrong.

KOREA

So the Filipino soldier again died in the battlefields of Korea beside his American comrades for the same cause, while the Republic of the Philippines was fighting its own war of survival against the Huk, the armed elements of communism in my country who had staged their own violent national liberation movement.

VIETNAM

And today we send our sons to South Vietnam on an errand of mercy although we face the retaliation of armed communism in our own land in the midst of a financial crisis.

What matters was that you had willingly abided by the true image of America, at once providing in the Philippines a condition of the spirit of freedom: founding throughout the country a universal educational system; replacing the feudal dispensation of the once regnant Spanish regime with civil institutions; helping the Commonwealth Government in its efforts to implement social and economic reforms, and, finally, introducing into our much-Europeanized culture, the technology, awareness, ideas, and expertise of the vigorous civilization of the new world.

And, as an Asian, may I say that this is precisely what has endeared the civilization of America to Asia. As Tugore had declared, at the turn of the 19th century, it is the modern spirit of Liberalism that makes the West relevant to us.

SECOND MESSAGE--VOTE OF THANKS

The second message from the Philippines is a vote of thanks to America.

History recalls that twice in this century America's power, wielded with courage and heroism by the American people, has provided the margin of strength needed to bring world wars to a victorious end. Twice after victory, America shunned the prospect of world domination and turned instead to the tasks of peace.

The Filipino people are thankful that the greatest military power in the world today is also the power most completely committed to the cause of world peace based on law and justice.

A distinguished historian has predicted that future generations will regard as the noblest achievement of our time, not military or scientific conquests,

but the acceptance of international responsibility for the welfare of the entire human family. If this should indeed be the verdict of history, America would be entitled to claim a major share of the credit. For America has pioneered in giving reality to the revolutionary concept that rich nations should help those less fortunate than themselves, not only because it is necessary to do so in today's interdependent world but because it is right.

We in the Philippines are also thankful America has discharged the awesome responsibility of being the first and foremost atomic power in the world with restraint and wisdom. Humanity's safety and its chances for survival rest in the hands of America and we thank God that those strong hands are firmly harnessed to the uses of peace and the heart that moves them entirely worthy of its solemn trust.

THIRD MESSAGE

My third message is of greater urgency from the Philippines as well as from all of Asia.

THE WALL OF FEAR

As an Asian friend who has read the Asian mind and heart, allow me to speak in candor.

We note some hesitancy, some frustration and doubts in America today.

After you lost the mainland of China to communism, after the battles of Korea and the debacle of Dien Bien Phu, you have doubted your own strength, your own competence, and questioned your own wisdom. Even after the commitment of your sons in Vietnam, still the question is asked: "Where are we headed for?" The mothers ask, "Why must our sons die in some unknown land?"

We condole with you because we too have lost our sons in battle. We too have known the horrors of war. God grant that America will never know what we have known at first hand—Manila was the most ravaged city in the Far East after World War II, and, in the distinguished company of bombed-out shattered cities, was next only to Warsaw.

God grant that America will never see what we saw—an occupation army in full control of city and countryside.

And we know what guerrilla warfare means; we are intimate with its cruel connotations. And we know what it is to die in jungle fastnesses as well as in street corners and alleys—as your young men once knew death in Berlin and Paris, as they are experiencing now in the mud and mire of South Vietnam.

The Philippines is the only country, perhaps, which has overcome a national Communist rebellion with its own indigenous troops—without the aid of alien soldiery. And even today in the Philippines communism again has resurged as a reaction to our increased aid to the Republic of Vietnam.

You who have lost your sons in an unknown land—why such death, you ask? When will these sacrifices end, and what does the future hold for all of us?

These are your questions. Gone for our moment of history is Grotius and his vision of world order. Only you can an-

swer these questions. I can only offer you my thoughts.

You have built around you a wall of fear—the wall of fear of Asia and all things Asian. It is the wall of fear of Asian communism. It is the wall of the unknown, the distant, the unplumbed risks, and the imagined terrors.

For a time Asia cringed in anxiety as there were suggestions that you forfeit your leadership in the Pacific because of fear.

America, the time has not yet come for you to lay down the heavy burden of leadership. Out of the bounty of your human and material resources, this great country has already given more generously to the common fund of human welfare than any other single nation in history. In the lifetime of this generation alone, America has contributed more to the security and well-being of the free world than could ever be repaid by its beneficiaries.

For America by the inscrutable judgment of destiny has become the trustee of civilization for all humanity. And America cannot escape this role.

WE ARE NOT WINNING THE WAR FOR THE MIND AND HEART OF ASIA

The summons to America is worldwide, but the area of greatest urgency is my own region, Asia. In Asia today, the issue of world war or world peace hangs in perilous balance. In Asia the future of freedom is being disputed in battlefields as well as in the minds and hearts of men—in the hamlets, the marketplaces. Last year we were losing the military war. Today the tide has turned. The military initiative has transferred to Vietnam and her allies. But we are not winning the war for the mind and heart of Asia. We are in danger of losing it.

In Asia the ultimate questions are being asked concerning man's capacity, in this atomic age, to survive his own suicidal instincts, fashion workable modes of coexistence, and eventually build that better world to which his nobler self aspires.

THE THREE CHALLENGES

Asia today challenges America and the rest of the world in three vital fields: security from aggression; economic cooperation; and the definition of the moral and political basis upon which a new, more creative, more stable partnership could be built.

VIETNAM

The war in Vietnam agitates the whole world and has brought into sharp focus the problems of Asian security. We stand with America in maintaining that aggression, whether perpetrated openly or by proxy must be deterred and defeated, that all nations, Asian or not, are entitled to freedom from fear of subversion or overt attack, that they should have the period of peace they need to attend unmolested to their urgent tasks of economic and social development.

AFTER VIETNAM

But peace or victory in Vietnam is only part of the answer to the question of Asian security. After Vietnam resurgent China poses the bigger problem. Very soon Communist China's growing military power may match its intransigence and its expansionist ambitions. This is

the looming menace to Asian and world security today.

If the problem were simply a power equation, it could be solved tomorrow. But at the heart of the matter lies an agonizing dilemma.

THE DANGEROUS PERIOD OF A SECURITY GAP

To the free Asian nations rightly belong the primary responsibility for their own security and well-being. This is an inevitable and a welcome consequence of independence. It is a privilege as well as a duty. However, China's power, blatantly militant and still unrestrained by firm commitments to international law, is developing during the dangerous interim period when the other Asian states, whether jointly or alone, cannot organize adequate defensive strength and before the United Nations has perfected its capacity to maintain international peace and order. The resulting security gap invites intervention, subversion, and foreign-inspired "wars of liberation." This dangerous security gap which is the present period can only be filled by America. However much Asian nations may abhor or at best regard with distrust such non-Asian power. It is only American military power that is acceptable in Asia and great enough to deter Communist China's aggressive tendencies.

As an Asian who has made it his life-work to study and know the Asian mind and heart as reflected in the different countries, allow me to remind you that the old hard-core leaders around Mao Tse-tung are firmly and securely in power. The mantle of authority upon the demise of Mao Tse-tung will fall upon the shoulders of Marshal Lin Biao, the prophet of Mao Tse-tung still supported by Chou En-lai. This is a hard political reality. During the lifetime of these leaders at the least, it is believed by many that there is no probability of the moderation or mellowing of Chinese Communist policies. It is felt that Mao Tse-tung's version of protracted war, the war of national liberation, shall be utilized as an instrument of ideological expansion by means of an interminable wave of guerrilla action sustained by ruthless terror.

We are not against negotiations with Red China nor do we espouse a cutting of communications with them. On the contrary, we will support every effort to keep the channels of communication open and hope that negotiation can bring about a suspension of hostilities—but the military initiative just recently recovered should not be forfeited.

LIN BIAO'S PATTERN FOR CONQUEST

Marshal Lin Biao's pattern of world conquest is summed up in his terse simplification that in the world Asia, Africa, and Latin America are the rural areas while Western Europe and North America are the cities. That when the rural areas are conquered, the cities will fall as was their experience in the Chinese mainland.

AMERICAN NATIONAL INTEREST

Asia may fall but America is the ultimate target. It is, therefore, to your national interest that the plan be aborted.

HOPES FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

For the past several months, several Asian states, the Philippines among

them, have been working quietly and unobtrusively to bring about the first prerequisite to peace in Vietnam and that is to establish lines of communications between North and South Vietnam. The suspension of hostilities in South Vietnam can be attained only by the selfless obsession for anonymity by the negotiators that is required in delicate and sensitive negotiations of this nature.

To bring about peace in Vietnam will involve long, tedious, confidential, and secret negotiations. Patience and fortitude and just the right touch of sophistication and civility in the conduct of these negotiations will succeed. Publicity should come only after peace has been negotiated.

From my point of view it will not matter who will claim the credit for having brought about the successful negotiation. What matters now is that this violent, ruthless, and wasteful war must be brought to the conference table.

The effectivity and success of the quiet type of diplomacy that I propose and advocate has been demonstrated in the dismantling of the confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia in which the Philippines had a modest share.

Even in this modern world for the success of conciliation the most important factor to regard in Asian diplomacy is that no nation or leader or diplomat loses face in the negotiations. Losing face is still an unpardonable offense to an Asian.

AN ASIAN POLITICAL FORUM

Perhaps in this juncture it is now timely to speak frankly of the possibility of an aggrupation of Asian states constituting the cadre under the United Nations into a political forum which can defuse or even settle any crisis that may arise in the region.

Such an aggrupation of necessity accepts again the reality of the diversity of ideology among Asian nations. But an aggrupation of like-minded states would of necessity be suspect and be unable to bring about communication between conflicting countries with different ideologies and political beliefs. The establishment of the Asian Development Bank, I hope, will bring the different nations together close enough and condition them to cooperation so that they can hammer out such an arrangement.

AMERICAN POWER ON TERMS ACCEPTABLE TO ASIAN NATIONALISM

The crux of the problem for America is to bring American power to bear in Asia on terms acceptable to Asian nationalism. It is a difficult but not an impossible task. Communist China's attacks on Korea, Tibet, and India had alerted neighboring countries to a developing pattern of expansionist design. The unsuccessful, Communist-inspired coup d'etat in Indonesia last year projected this design into the forefront of Asian consciousness. The result was a greatly heightened realization that Communist China, soon to become a nuclear power, has everybody's security problem requiring, for its solution, the cooperation of everyone.

THE NEW FACTOR—CHINA A COMMON SECURITY PROBLEM TO ALL ASIAN NATIONS: AMERICA'S DETERRENT POWER A NECESSITY

This new factor in the Asian solution is just beginning to be discerned and has not yet fully developed and cannot be appreciated outside Asia. It is among the most significant and heartening developments in the region in that one of its meaningful aspects is the possible growing desire for regional cooperation not only in the economic and social fields but possibly also in the political and security matters.

Another is the enhanced awareness that for the present and the years immediately ahead, Communist China's neighbors cannot expect, singly or together, to "balance" China's crucial margin of nuclear power without the assistance of non-Asian countries like America. There is in consequence a new disposition to regard America's deterrent power in Asia as a necessity for the duration of time required by the Asian nations to develop their own system of regional security supported by what they hope would have become a greatly strengthened United Nations.

THE THREE CONDITIONS OF ASIAN COOPERATION

It is a mood, both realistic and hopeful. Regarded with understanding and consideration, it could offer a wider basis for Asian cooperation than America has been able to achieve in the past. Three conditions are indispensable to the realization of that broader association. It must be based not on the narrow ideological alignments of the cold war but on the inescapable reality of Asian diversity. It must work with the tide of Asian nationalism instead of running counter to it. And it must be constructive in spirit and purpose, looking beyond victory in Vietnam to the creation of a milieu of justice and a rule of law under which all Asian nations could achieve their maximum potential for peaceful growth.

NOT TOO SOON TO EXPLORE THE POSSIBILITY

The experience of Vietnam suggests that it is not too soon to explore the creative possibilities of this new approach. To function in Asia without full Asian support is to build on shifting sand. The greater the power projected from outside into Asia, the more compelling the need that it should operate in harmony with Asian aspirations, toward goals compatible with Asian independence and dignity.

THE CHALLENGES TO AMERICA AND ASIA

America's deepening appreciation of this need for a genuine basis of understanding and common purpose with Asia coincides with the growing desire in the region for security from aggression of all kinds, open or disguised, Asian or non-Asian. The challenge to America is to extend to Asia the defensive shield of American power in forms consonant with Asian freedom and self-respect. The challenge to Asia is to discard the dry meatless bone of mysticism and fatalism, for the life-giving substance of aspiration and endeavor; to leave the past behind, recognize today's need for energetic self-reliance and dignified maturity; to

make common cause against aggression, and meet America halfway in a joint undertaking to make the future secure for all.

AMERICAN DISENGAGEMENT FROM ASIA

After the United States recognized the independence of the Philippines in 1946, the American Government reluctantly yet realistically accepted the triumph of Communist power in the Chinese mainland as an accomplished fact. Still later, the Allied occupation of Japan, which was essentially an American operation, was formally terminated. All these developments added up to a recognizable policy of American disengagement from the affairs of Asia.

EUROPE-FIRST POLICY

In Europe, the trend was exactly the opposite. To the challenge of Soviet power following the end of the Second World War, the United States and its European allies countered with NATO. In rapid succession, the Soviet attempt to drive the Western Allies from West Berlin was deflected by the Berlin airlift, and the Communist threat against Greece and Turkey was nullified by the Truman doctrine. America made it abundantly clear that it was not prepared to see Western Europe overrun by Soviet power.

Thus, American policy in the period after the war conformed more or less to the Europe-first doctrine that had dominated Allied strategy during the war. The Filipino people, who were the main sacrificial victims of that wartime strategy, were deeply concerned that a similar strategic concept would govern the postwar policy of the United States. In 1949, from this same rostrum, President Elpidio Quirino, the second President of the Republic of the Philippines, called upon the United States to respond to the Communist menace in Asia with a Pacific equivalent of NATO. His appeal fell on deaf ears, however, and the following year he was compelled to convoke in Baguio City, on his own responsibility, and without American support, the first Conference of Southeast Asia.

KOREA—THE U.N.

Within months after the holding of the Baguio Conference, the Communists struck in Korea. President Truman, who had firmly challenged Communist ambitions in Europe while acquiescing to a policy of disengagement from Asia, suddenly realized that Communist power was reaching out boldly toward Asia. Under the banner of the United Nations, the United States and 15 other States, including the Philippines, joined forces to repel the Communist invasion of South Korea.

THE SEATO

Out of the bitter experience of the war in Korea, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—was born. This happened in Manila in 1954, 4 years after President Quirino had first advocated the establishment of an anti-Communist alliance to serve as the Asian equivalent of NATO. At the same time, the United States entered into mutual defense alliances with the Philippines, Japan, Aus-

tralia, and New Zealand. All these things were done under then much-scorned but now surprisingly topical Dulles doctrine of "brinkmanship" and "massive retaliation".

THE SALIENT ELEMENTS OF AMERICAN POLICY

The salient elements of American policy emerge from this brief recital of recent events. The first is that, following the end of the Second World War, there was a deliberate attempt to orient American policy away from Asia and the Pacific toward Europe and the Atlantic. The second is that American policy in Asia has been essentially passive in character, developed and pursued mainly in response to Communist initiatives in subversion, aggression, and conquest. In short, the United States has been a reluctant participant in the affairs of Asia.

UNLIMITED COMMITMENT IN EUROPE, LIMITED COMMITMENT IN ASIA

That reluctance did not spring from a new spirit of isolationism among the American people: It sprang rather from the feeling that prevailed among the makers of American foreign policy at the time that while the United States could undertake a virtually unlimited commitment to defend Europe, it could only accept a limited commitment to defend Asia. This was duly reflected in the differing obligations accepted by the United States under NATO and SEATO. American awareness of closer racial and cultural affinities with Europe probably justified this attitude in a situation where American power was, in any case, inadequate to police the world as a whole.

VIETNAM JUSTIFIED NEITHER BY AFFINITY NOR UN KOREA EXAMPLE

Today, we face the fact of massive American involvement in Vietnam—in a struggle which can neither be explained on the basis of recognized affinities nor justified by the example of the previous United Nations action in Korea.

HISTORY—UNITED STATES WAS FIRST PACIFIC POWER BEFORE IT WAS AN ATLANTIC POWER

History, however, may provide both explanation and justification. One elementary fact of American history is that the United States was a Pacific power long before it became an Atlantic power. President Washington's injunctions against "entangling alliances" and President Monroe's promulgation of the doctrine that bears his name insured America's virtual isolation from European affairs. This isolation lasted a long time, and America did not become an Atlantic power until after the First World War.

COMMODORE PERRY AND JAPAN, PHILIPPINES HAWAII, AND ALASKA

By contrast, the United States became a Pacific power just before the Civil War, when Commodore Perry opened feudal Japan to the modern world. This was followed at the turn of the last century by the acquisition of the Philippines, Hawaii and Alaska, and by American support of the open door policy in China. American rule over the Philippines, the war in the Pacific, and the American occupation of Japan confirmed and strengthened the status of the United States as a Pacific power.

The American presence in Vietnam makes sense only when viewed in the historical context of the development of the United States as a Pacific power.

To recall this chapter of American history is not, of course, necessarily to justify the motives that brought the United States to Asia. The truth is that the American Republic, having isolated itself from the affairs of Europe and having had no share in the spoliation of Africa, was obliged to turn to Asia, across the Pacific as the object of its belated imperialist attentions.

NO MORE IMPERIALIST AMBITIONS IN ASIA

Today, having relinquished control of the Philippines and terminated the occupation of Japan, the United States can truthfully disavow any surviving imperialist ambitions in Asia. The presence of American bases and American troops in South Korea, Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines could be justified as aiming solely to deter or repel any encroachments of Communist power in these areas.

REPEAT THE AVOWALS

This point should be made indubitably clear in the case of the American presence in Vietnam. Americans and their Government should never tire repeating that the United States is in Vietnam for the purpose of assisting that nation in defending its independence and territorial integrity. They should give every assurance that they are not in Vietnam, or anywhere else in Asia, for the purpose of political hegemony or economic gain. This, President Johnson has repeatedly done.

Such avowals of American purpose would correspond to the deepest aspirations of the non-Communist Asian nations themselves. Their common hope and desire is to be given an opportunity to consolidate their independence, to translate it in terms of a better life for their citizens, to determine and shape the destiny of their country without outside interference of any kind. To achieve these goals, these non-Communist nations realize that they need the umbrella of American power to shield them from Communist infiltration, subversion, and aggression. Without attempting to establish new or enlarged military alliances, it should be possible for the United States to provide this protection for all those nations that desire and ask for it.

DOES AMERICA HAVE A NEGATIVE RECORD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS?

Does America have a "negative" record in foreign affairs? The record shows that the East-West confrontation in Europe has been stabilized and that Communist influence is in retreat in Asia and Africa. As late as 2 years ago, non-alignment or Communist-leaning neutralism was the prevailing policy among Asian states. Today, Ceylon, India, and Indonesia have virtually abandoned their old, familiar stance of neutralism and become firmly anti-Communist. Pakistan appears to be desisting from its open flirtation with Communist China, while the Communist parties of North Korea and Japan have declared their independence of Peking.

BENEFITS FROM AMERICAN PRESENCE

I personally know for a fact that the American presence in Vietnam provided—though quite unintentionally—encouragement and support to those who successfully resisted the attempted Communist takeover in Indonesia. It is certain that the U.S. 7th Fleet in the China Sea as well as American airpower in the area rendered inoperative the so-called "Peking-Jakarta axis" which the Indonesian Communist Party might otherwise have invoked in the extremity of its disastrous debacle in Java.

In effect, and almost without realizing it, we are even now already reaping valuable dividends from the American presence in Vietnam. Those benefits are certain to multiply as the non-Communist neighbors of China understand that their security is guaranteed by the umbrella of American power. The assurance that has been given by President Johnson that this protection will not suddenly be withdrawn tomorrow, thus leaving them to the mercy of Chinese communism, is an indispensable factor in maintaining the stability of south-east Asia.

DOMINO THEORY

The so-called "domino theory" which many experts tend to discount, may be an oversimplification. But it is certainly correct to argue that a country like Thailand, for example, is hardly likely to depend for its security on an American army that has been defeated or has withdrawn under fire from Vietnam. Thailand would have to adjust to Chinese hegemony in Asia and its attitude would be shared in varying degrees by Laos, Malaysia, India, Pakistan, Japan, and the Philippines.

OBJECT—"CORDON SANITAIRE"

Our object must be to hold the line in Vietnam and, at least, to roll back Communist power behind the 17th parallel. This being achieved, we shall have provided a necessary basis for joint action among the southeast Asia nations themselves in order to insure their collective security.

When this has been done, American military power could withdraw to existing bases in the outlying islands and archipelagos: Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, and the Philippines. Together with the U.S. 7th Fleet, this line of defense off the Asian mainland could be rendered completely impregnable, while offering needed support to any mainland nation that may be threatened by Communist power.

With this "cordon sanitaire" effectively established around the eastern and southern flanks of Communist China, the latter might then realize that it could more usefully harness its energies to the enormous task of satisfying the needs and improving the livelihood of its 700 million people. Or it could turn around and begin looking over and across the 5,000-mile front which it shares with the Soviet Union. But that would be another story.

There was reason to say in mitigation of Communist China's avowed policy of universal revolution, that is, of abetting and assisting "people's wars" abroad, that while the rulers of Peking are vio-

lent in their speeches, they are remarkably nonviolent in their actions. In recent weeks, however, many of the statements of the Chinese Communist leaders as well as some of the actions which they have tolerated or encouraged, appear to verge dangerously on the irrational. Prudence dictates that we should beware lest the fanaticism behind their words translates itself into fanatical action, and lest their irrationality in domestic matters merely foreshadows irrationality in foreign affairs.

No Asian country or government desires the destruction of Communist China. We who are its neighbors realize that we must coexist with China and the Chinese people. We need to adjust to the overwhelming fact that it exists in our very midst. But, equally, Communist China must accept the obligation to coexist peacefully with its neighbors. This means that it must abandon and fore-swear its policy of exporting violence and fomenting disorder amongst its neighbors.

Until we receive assurances to this end, the policy of the military containment of China must continue.

WINSTON CHURCHILL ON GREATNESS

It was Winston Churchill who said, as he rallied the battle-weary people of Britain during the last war, that the true measure of a nation's greatness is what it can do when it is tired. On the basis of this criterion, the United States may not, because of divided counsel at home, because of increasing fatigue from endless responsibility, or because of impatience with difficult allies, lay down the heavy burden of power and, in effect, resign as the leader-nation of the free world.

It is not easy for someone not an American to say these things to Americans at a most trying moment in their history. It would behoove an outsider to keep discreet silence on questions that have so deeply divided Americans. Having served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II and as a guerrilla officer during the Japanese occupation, I cannot be indifferent to the grief of thousands of Americans and Vietnamese whose brothers, sons, and husbands are fighting and dying in Vietnam.

Though I have spoken of our stake in Vietnam in terms of a battle of ideologies and a contest for power, I do not forget that the values involved in that struggle are profoundly human. Because the stakes are high, even decisive, involving the very future of freedom in Asia and, ultimately, in the world as a whole, including this country, we should like to see the hand of America remain steady and sure on the wheel of power and responsibility. We should like to be reassured that this great country, its people and Government, shall never act upon the agonizing issues of our time in disgust or anger, or from a feeling of tiredness or a sense of panic, but in the knowledge that they are confronted with responsibilities that must be met, tasks that must be accomplished, and battles that must be waged with all the courage and wisdom at their command.

THE PARALLEL IN THE ECONOMIC FIELD--MAXIMUM SELF-HELP AND THE ECONOMIC DEFICIENCY

A parallel situation obtains in the economic field. Here, too, the primary responsibility rests with the Asian countries themselves. Economic and social development on a scale commensurate with the aroused expectations of their own people is a task deserving of their greatest effort and utmost dedication. Maximum self-help should be their watchword dictated as much by self-respect as by sheer necessity. But here, too, even heroic national exertions may yet leave between success and failure, between poverty and prosperity, a vital margin--the economic gap which only assistance from outside can fill at this stage. And as in the field of security, foreign aid, though needed and desired, must be extended without the harsh demands that remind Asia of its past enslavement and with some sophistication if not idealism, in ways compatible with Asian nationalism.

THE LINKS OF ECONOMICS TO SECURITY

The links of economics with the problem of peace are less obvious but no less real. Poverty is not only a fertile seed-bed for Communist dictatorship and other extreme solutions; it is also the open gate to foreign-inspired subversion and the open road to "wars of national liberation." When it afflicts a region as vast and as populous as Asia, it becomes a major threat to world peace.

ASIA AND THE DREADFUL POTENTIAL OF TRIGGERING A WORLD WAR

One-half of mankind living in abject want or at bare subsistence levels constitute an enormous drag on world prosperity. Itself already a "sea of troubles," impoverished Asia also has the more dreadful potential of triggering another World War, offering as it does an almost irresistible temptation for foreign intervention. And in the growing economic bipolarization of the world into rich nations becoming richer and poor nations becoming poorer--one of the most serious long-term threats to international security--Asia with its population explosion, its unsatisfied wants, and its deeply rooted grievances against the past, would be a major factor for all of humanity.

Much is already being done through existing organizations, within as well as outside the United Nations, to meet Asia's need for economic aid. More is required to fill that vital margin between failure and success which even the most devoted application of self-help cannot bridge. Increased capital investments and more effective technical assistance are essential. But more important in the long run is the enhancement of the feeling of partnership between the nations giving aid and the nations receiving it.

THE MORAL BASIS OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Precisely because there is no short cut to economic development, the human factor should be kept constantly in view. The moral basis of economic assistance should never be forgotten in the pre-occupation with its material superstruc-

ture. A sense of joint involvement in one of the great enterprises of this century is needed to sustain both the rich and the poor nations during the long, difficult journey toward the goal of a better life for all envisaged by the United Nations Charter.

THE MORAL ASPECT OF PARTICULAR RELEVANCE TO ASIA

The moral aspect of economic cooperation is of particular relevance to Asia. The nations of Asia give high priority to economic progress. But their deepest hunger is not of the body; it is a hunger of the spirit: the desire, after centuries of colonial bondage, for the fullest attainable measure of human equality and human dignity.

THE LONGINGS OF ASIA

This is the reason why the American declaration of independence still transmits a living message to the peoples of Asia, why they hold Lincoln the emancipator in such high regard, and why they have been so deeply moved by Roosevelt's proclamation of the four freedoms, Kennedy's ringing summons to a global alliance for the upliftment of the human condition throughout the world; and that is why President Johnson is called the liberator of Asia with his solemn promise of military security and his challenge to a social revolution.

THEY MISJUDGE ASIA

They misjudge Asia who believe that the material factor will be decisive for Asia's future. And they malign Asia who imagine that Asian nations are craven opportunists, intimidated by brute strength and ever ready to join the winning side. America's Philippine experience belies both beliefs. And if an Asian leader were to be asked to choose between indignity and hunger, he would unhesitatingly choose hunger. And his people would go hungry with him.

ASIA IS AN ANCIENT CIVILIZATION

For Asia is an ancient civilization; and its culture is essentially shaped by philosophy and religion and its actions moved by its ethical precepts. And when we react to the West, it is its materialism, its scientific power that we confront and the signs of enervation of its spirit. We discover a prosperous society, advanced in its technology and living by the fundamentals of power and the machine and by its material excesses.

But even here we perceive the fact of conflict arising from the inability of peoples to accommodate the yearnings of purely human values to be projected in this materialistic culture. And indeed in our world, we witness not merely total war but also the acceptance of the totalization of doom. Beneath the overt unresolved conflicts of nations is the reality of human conflict--man against his culture because it has not been able to accommodate entirely his values and even man against himself.

THE HUMAN CONDITION IS A DIALECTIC

The human condition is a dialectic and man himself has forfeited the inner harmony of his own nature.

Between the conceptions and actions of our civilization is a great divide of dis-

cordant facts. We have a politics, for instance, openly declared on democratic principles, but we witness the reality of inequality in our times; the fact of the subversion of the self-determination of nations; the disintegration of international law itself because of the inability of nations and powers in the international community to live by the postulates of the rule of law. The system of groitius and the efforts of internationalists to enlist reason and an ordered postulate of justice in the settlement of disputes have found no concrete actuality.

And yet, it cannot be denied that in our century the evidence of material advancement and the prosperity of peoples is more true than at any other period of human history. The conclusion, therefore, is undeniable: that man cannot be sustained by the actuality of materialism; that he does not live by bread alone, and that it is only when wealth identifies itself with the spirit that it justifies itself.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP NOT ONLY MILITARY BUT SPIRITUAL

American leadership has never been solely military; more accurately, it has consistently been spiritual.

THE MARSHALL PLAN, AND SO FORTH

Your Marshall plan to a devastated Europe; your corps of peace volunteers to Africa and Asia; your concern with the democratic rehabilitation of Japan, an enemy country, even your economic aid to developing societies, and your readiness to come to the defense of nations beleaguered in their just fight for sovereign rights—this is not America, the military imperialist, but the same America which saw in the conditions of the Philippines, my country, the prospect for a democratic experiment in Asia, the dismantling of the colonial machinery that was to end the enslavement of many peoples of the world.

In Vietnam are the savagery and ferocity, the treachery and bloodiness of war. Yet, there America has identified itself with individual fulfillment, with freedom, with nobility of the soul, with social justice.

For all the iron and steel you have piled on solid ground, Vietnam remains a vision and spirit which posterity, given the perspective of time, will be able to judge in its true light.

THE RELEVANCE OF REASSERTION OF AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

There is, therefore, the relevance of a reassertion of American leadership—a leadership based on the concepts of this new society as it was defined by your Founding Fathers and reiterated in the American Declaration of Independence—a leadership that is bold and vigorous in its liberalism, cutting across the distances between peoples which were created by misunderstanding, ignorance, and differences of human conditions and, just as your Founding Fathers had ventured out to the open seas so much feared for their imaginary terrors and false depths of risks, let America once

more break through the wall of fear of Asia which has kept peoples apart and nations divided.

THE AMERICA ENSHRINED

This is the America which the old world had enshrined in its liberalism; the new society which immediately found acceptance from the disenchanted nations of Europe and Asia at the turn of the 19th century—the image of the new world that had bewitched Dutch sailors' eyes and the migrating vision of those who took flight from the tyranny of monarchies—the green light of the 20th century that has heretofore been a beacon of the lost ideals of our times.

This is what has ennobled the image of America.

HOW CAN AMERICA REACH THE HEART OF ASIA?

To those who ask how America can reach the heart of Asia, I say: let America speak from the depths of its own heart; with the voice of Jefferson, with the compassion of Lincoln, with the vision of Roosevelt, with Kennedy's clarion call to a crusade in behalf of the weak, the oppressed, and defenseless; for a world of hope, lawful order and growing freedom; let America speak through President Johnson's challenge for the social revolution that would transform human society without violence to human rights.

America, speak to Asia in the words of President Johnson when he said:

By peace in Asia I do not mean simply the absence of armed hostilities. For where men hunger and hate, there can be no place.

I do not mean that peace of conquest. For humiliation can be the seedbed of war.

And I do not mean simply the peace of the conference table. For peace is not written merely in the words of treaties, but in the day-by-day works of builders.

The peace we seek in Asia is a peace of conciliation: between Communist States and their non-Communist neighbors; between rich nations and poor; between small nations and large; between men whose skins are brown and black and yellow and white; between Hindus and Moslems and Buddhists and Christians.

It is a peace that can only be sustained through the durable bonds of peace: through international trade; through the free flow of people and ideas; through full participation by all nations in an international community under law; and through a common dedication to the great tasks of human progress and economic development. Is such a peace possible?

With all my heart, I believe it is. We are not there yet. We have a long way to journey.

Addressed in these accents, Asia will listen. Confronted with this challenge, Asia will respond.

LAST MESSAGE

My last message to you is hard for me to articulate.

Let me bare my heart to you. I have come not as an enemy. I have contributed my modest share in the payment of the price for the liberties and ideals which we all cherish.

It is precisely because of this that I have been hounded by loud persistent criticisms that I am much too pro-American in my policies. Perhaps I am—emotionally so. For I was one of the many who gambled everything—life, dreams and honor—on a faith in and the vision of America, when all was lost as the Stars and Stripes for the first time in history was trodden to the ground in Asia. I have faith in your objectives in Asia and am deeply convinced that democracy such as ours in the Philippines can thrive in an ocean of neutrals and Communists but only if you keep true to and abide by the image of fairness that is America.

And the truth is all of Asia watches how America will treat her most loyal and steadfast ally. The whole world watches if America will mete out justice to the Filipino veterans. There are rumblings among my people. Far too many of them, including some of our intellectual leaders, have long ago lost faith in your sense of fairness. Without necessarily heeding the importunings of our Communist enemies, they are harsh critics and have given up hope of American justice. They claim American policy desires only the permanence or predominance of American power in Asia regardless of what happens to the individual Asian and that you could not care less who lost his head to the tyrant provided that tyrant was your tyrant. They cry "American help is self-help; America is a friend in need, her need."

And it is paradoxical that after the Second World War we have had to endure American ridicule for our claims to equal rights under the veterans laws of this country. We are unprepared for the rebuffs that we received but even less prepared for the hostility in the attitudes of some of your executive officials who have had to deal with us. Our former common enemy, Japan, had been patient and understanding. From you, our Allies, we expected nothing less. But we did not get it.

Sometimes I have stood alone or with a few loyal comrades as of old, beleaguered by a sea of opposition as I reaffirmed loyalty to the American image.

So, upon the kind invitation of your great President, I have come to you with leave of my people. When I sought their counsel, they told me: "Go, young man of many dreams and many scars, go to your friends. Go but once and no more." I can hear them say still: "Go with our misgivings for we know only too well the Americans' disdain for state visitors who go to their land with promises of loyalty to their ideals and global objectives but with their palms and hands stretched out for aid. Do not beg for aims or aid for we do not solicit charity.

"But tell them loyalty is not for sale. There is no price tag for faith except justice.

"Go and tell them this. If, after they have heard you, they remain unmoved,

then with sorrow and grief tell them we are prepared to close this unfortunate chapter of Philippine-American history. With dignity, the Philippines shall stand alone as we have done in the past, fighting off the terrors of our enemies. If we are overwhelmed, then Asia is lost to communism but we would have had our share of conflict. And if we fall, we shall have fallen with pride and shall have died with honor."

But the critics were more cruel. And even the veterans scoff at our own scars in battle. One of these scars I received in trying to save an American comrade. "Where is he now?" they ask. "He is dead like many of our dreams."

Yes, my American comrade died in my arms. We were surrounded and we had to break out. He fell and, as he tried to crawl to safety, I returned to him, to fall at his side—Filipino and American blood commingling in Philippine soil.

As I cradled him in my arms to a fox-hole, he died with the words: "Tell them back home, you who will live, my only regret in dying is that America has failed us."

I, the Filipino, assured the American, as if this would assuage his dying, "No, America does not forget and will not fail us."

Many years are past. Time should have muted the tone of confidence and the tyranny of circumstance should have eroded the memory but still today, I say to you as I have said to my people: "America does not forget. America will not fail us."